




OZYMANDIAS PRESS

Ephraim Emerton

A History of the Hundred Years War

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



ENDYMION PRESS

HISTORY OF THE HUNDRED YEARS WAR

EPHRAIM EMERTON

HISTORY OF THE HUNDRED YEARS WAR

Ephraim Emerton

ENDYMION PRESS

Thank you for reading. If you enjoy this book, please [leave a review](#).

All rights reserved. Aside from brief quotations for media coverage and reviews, no part of this book may be reproduced or distributed in any form without the author's permission. Thank you for supporting authors and a diverse, creative culture by purchasing this book and complying with copyright laws.

Copyright © 2016 by Ephraim Emerton

Published by Endymion Press

Interior design by Pronoun

Distribution by Pronoun

ISBN: 9781531292126

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I.
- II.
- III.
- IV.
- V.

I.

$\sim$

THE LONG CONFLICT BETWEEN FRANCE and England, to which historians have given the name of "The Hundred Years' War," interests us chiefly as an illustration on a great scale of the transition from the mediæval, feudal order of society to the modern, national idea of political organization. Its nearer causes were largely feudal, and its methods were still, to a great extent, those of the earlier period. Its remoter causes, however, and the motives that kept it alive are to be sought on both sides in a steadily growing sense of national unity and national honor. Under the feudal régime it may fairly be said that it mattered little to the landholding aristocracy whether it were under the sovereignty of one king or another. The thing it really cared about was whether its privileges were such as it had a right to expect, and whether these privileges were likely to be fully and honorably maintained. So long as this was the case the barons found their profit and their glory in standing by their king in those undertakings which had a certain national character. But if their rights were tampered with, or if another sovereign offered equal guaranties of privilege, they easily took advantage of the flexible feudal arrangements to shift their allegiance.

While this is true of both the countries engaged in this desperate struggle, there is evident by the close of the thirteenth century a very marked difference between them. English feudalism had always differed from that of France in its relation to the overlord. The impulse given to the royal power by William the Conqueror had never been quite lost. The rights of the crown had been steadily enforced, and what might have seemed a great disadvantage, namely, the absence of a large and compact *domaine* which might become the nucleus of a monarchical state, had really proved an element of strength. For if the monarchy in England were to be maintained at all, it could only be through the willingness of its subjects to support it. Doubtless there were many times when this loyalty had been strained almost to the breaking point, but the necessity under which the English king was put of appealing to all his people instead of relying upon the resources of a great *domaine* had proved a powerful educating force in bringing about, on the whole, a harmonious working together of the several elements in the English state. On the other hand, it is clear that a rich family property overseas in France was a very tempting prize to an ambitious king in England. It offered him a chance, similar to that which his French rival enjoyed, of disciplining troublesome barons or obstinate parliaments by means of resources not dependent upon their good will. From this point of view, therefore, we can quite understand the energy with which the English kings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries pursued this ambition, to hold and to increase the lands in France which had come to them by way of feudal inheritance. Yet it remains true that while these lands, one after another, fell away from them by the chances of feudal succession, the monarchy was gaining slowly but surely in its hold on the people of England. Further, the smaller

extent of English territory, its comparative isolation, and the relatively greater uniformity of its population made it more easily possible for its kings to assert themselves as against the rival interests of barons or of commons. The definite establishment of Parliament toward the close of the thirteenth century offered a point of application for all measures looking towards a wider extension of the royal power as the price of a more firmly founded popular liberty. In a word, by the year 1300 English nationality was no mere dream of the future. It was finding its expression in a popular monarchy and in a vigorous, self-conscious national life. In France a similar effort at concentration of royal power had been proceeding on different lines and had led to different results. We have already examined some of the processes by which the French kings of the thirteenth century had succeeded in enforcing their judicial authority outside their own *domaine*, while at the same time they were widening as far as possible the extent of the *domaine* itself. In both these ways the gain had been very great, so that when, in the early years of the fourteenth century, King Philip IV had called upon the nation to support him in his trial of strength with Pope Boniface VIII, the response had been, on the whole, surprisingly prompt and complete. Yet in all the measures of all the kings from Philip Augustus to Philip IV the essentially feudal structure of the French state had not seriously been called in question. The king could never forget that he was himself a feudal prince, a landbaron like the rest, and the aim of his policy was always not to crush his feudal rivals but to substitute himself for them. When a principality of France became *domaine*, the king succeeded to the rights of the former lord. For the moment nothing was changed in the land except its headship. Its "customs" – that is, the legal status of its inhabitants – were not essentially altered; the same contributions of men and money that had formerly been paid to the lord were now due to the king. Even before such annexation to the crown, it had been possible, certainly from the time of Philip Augustus, for the kings to maintain in the feudal territories royal officials with more or less extensive rights of jurisdiction and of taxation. After annexation the scope of action of these royal officials was simply increased, and they came to replace the similar officials formerly employed by the lesser lords. It is thus almost literally true that during our period the French kings were conquering France not often by the sword but gradually by the slower weapons of purchase, mortgage, forfeiture, gift, or inheritance.

The Hundred Years' War found France in the midst of this slow and difficult transformation. It is, of course, true that the farther the strengthening of the monarchy went, the greater momentum it gained toward overcoming the resistance of feudalism; but the peculiar character of the war, its long duration, the French reverses, and the dissensions among the leaders in French affairs are all to be understood only in the light of this conflict of political ideas. The monarchy at its best, as under Charles V, was too weak to control perfectly the resources it needed for the deliverance of the country. At its worst, as under

John "the Good," it was itself too hopelessly feudal to be a real leader in the national cause it failed so utterly to understand.

As between the two powers, then, at the opening of the Hundred Years' War, the advantage appeared to be on the side of England, – a small, compact, fairly homogeneous people under a popular and energetic monarchy over against a people widely extended, made up of many distinct racial elements, and divided against itself by strongly opposed class interests. The war was, on the whole, popular in England, while the French went into it for the first generation rather languidly and without any just sense of the great national issues involved. The armies and navies of England were almost entirely made up of Englishmen; the French, both on land and sea, fought with the aid of large contingents of hired foreigners. The English notion of fighting was to get the better of the enemy and to kill him off as fast as possible. The French leaders were still governed by the lofty but fantastic ideas of mediæval chivalry, which treated war rather as a game, to be played according to certain rules of honor, than as a desperate struggle of peoples bent on carrying their quarrel to the last extremity. It was only by the long training of the war itself that these notions were gradually dispelled and the French people taught that national unity was the indispensable condition of national honor.

The immediate occasion of the Hundred Years' War was a dynastic one. A glance at the table of the Valois family shows at once the question at issue. When King Philip IV died in 1314 he left three sons who followed him in regular succession upon the throne, and this in spite of the fact that the first two had each left daughters who might have succeeded them. The daughters had been set aside in pursuance of what was called the "Salic Law," and thus a precedent had been established for all future time. The last of the three brothers, Charles IV, dying in 1328, left his queen in near expectation of an heir. Should this child prove to be a daughter, it was evident that the same question would arise once more and would be so much the more troublesome as the men likely to appear as claimants were more remote from the main Capetian line. In any case there would have to be a regency, and the choice of a regent was felt to involve the whole question of the succession. The male person nearest to the three late kings was their cousin, Philip of Valois, whose claim descended in the male line from Philip III. Philip's claim to the regency was at once disputed by King Edward III of England, who was the son of a daughter of Philip IV and hence, like Philip of Valois, a descendant of Philip III. He based his claim on the fact of his descent through an elder, through a female, line and maintained that even if the Salic Law debarred a woman from the succession, it could not prevent her from transmitting to her descendants a right she could not herself exercise.

If both claimants had been Frenchmen the decision might have been difficult; as it was, the national spirit was strong enough to settle the matter. Philip of Valois was chosen regent by the barons of France and two months

later, on the birth of a daughter to the widow of Charles IV, he was proclaimed king. Then came the test question, – whether King Edward would accept the situation and do homage to King Philip for the lands which he held in France. Under earlier feudal conditions homage paid by one king to another had not seemed to involve any sacrifice of honor. The relation was a personal one and did not carry with it any reflection on the vassal king's duty to his own people. Now, however, under the new impulses of the national spirit, King Edward could but hesitate. Homage to the French king seemed to be, in a way, a stain upon the honor of the English people. Summoned by Philip VI to do homage in person, he failed to appear, and Philip made preparations to seize the revenues of his lands. In response to a second summons Edward came over to Amiens and there, in a personal interview, agreed to pay homage “by mouth and word,” but refused to place his hands in those of Philip and swear to be his liege man. It is significant that the reason he gave for his refusal was that he must refer the question to his Parliament and do as it would have him. Edward's conference with his advisers, the pressure of Philip's agents in Guienne, and the perpetual danger of war on the Scottish border resulted three years later (1331) in a formal declaration on his part that the homage at Amiens should be held to be *liege homage*, but only for those lands actually in the English possession.

The dynastic question seemed thus to be settled once for all, and so it might have remained but for a series of events not dynastic and not feudal in their nature, but rather political and economic. These were the affairs of Flanders, which we have treated more fully elsewhere. Politically, Flanders was to England what Scotland was to France, a country bound to her rival by ancient feudal ties, but stirred by the new spirit of national independence and seeking for a pretext to break or to weaken those earlier bonds. Economically the bond of Flanders with England was stronger than with France. The chief industry of the great Flemish cities, the manufacture of woollen cloths, was entirely dependent upon the ready importation of English wool, whereas the business dealings of Flanders with France were by comparison unimportant. The rich and powerful citizens of Ghent and Bruges were little inclined to bear the burdens of feudal service in order to maintain their lord, the count of Flanders, in his normal feudal relation to the French king. Especially was this the case when the feudal loyalty of their count to King Philip VI was met by Edward III with an embargo on English wool. “No wool, – no work!” was an appeal stronger than any sentiment of loyalty to prince or king. When the pinch of distress began to be felt, they listened eagerly to able leaders who were ready to show them a way out. Alliance with England was the obvious remedy, and to that policy Jacques van Artavelde, the ablest citizen of Flanders, was prepared to commit them. It was a glaring illustration of how far the old feudal spirit had given way to the demands of the new national states, that Edward III should relieve the scruples of the Flemish on the point of their loyalty to the king of

France by again declaring himself to be that person. Loyalty to him was thus in fact loyalty to France. It was a quibble unworthy of the great days of chivalry, but quite in harmony with the "practical" demands of modern politics.

This open violation of the dynastic settlement of 1331 was a challenge which Philip VI could not refuse, and both sides pressed their preparations for war. Indeed, for months past these preparations had been going on. King Edward had succeeded in bringing together a formidable group of allies. At a conference held at Valenciennes in May representatives of the count of Hainault, the dukes of Brabant and Geldern and several others of the lower Rhine princes, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, and the emperor Ludwig the Bavarian declared themselves in Edward's favor. Immediately afterward (May 24) Philip summoned the Council of Peers at Paris and with their approval declared that Edward had forfeited all fiefs held by him of the French crown. In a sense this was a declaration of war, but it is idle to attempt to throw the blame of what followed upon either party. Both were bent upon a trial of strength, and it was only a question of opportunity. That opportunity was offered by the situation in Flanders.

By far the most important ally of Edward III seemed to be the emperor Ludwig the Bavarian. The outbreak of hostilities between France and England coincided with the extraordinary series of political declarations in Germany by which the emperor and the electoral college proclaimed their independence of papal interference in the regular working of the imperial electoral machinery. The residence of the popes in France and their close relation to French politics seemed to throw Ludwig naturally on the English side. In the summer of 1338 King Edward left the Low Countries, where he had been strengthening his alliance with the local princes and set out on a journey up the Rhine. The emperor, after the great day at Rense, met him at Coblenz. All the electors of the Empire except King John of Bohemia, who was at the court of Philip VI, were present and gave their sanction to what followed. With every circumstance of solemnity the emperor made a public declaration that King Philip had forfeited his claim to the crown of France and proceeded to invest Edward III as imperial vicar. The precise meaning of this transaction is not clear. Edward names himself in documents: *Vicarius generalis per totam Alemanniam et Germaniam*, but it seems unlikely that anything more than the lower Rhine country, especially on the left bank, can have been intended. The fact is that Edward was warmly received both going and coming by the princes of that region. All followed the lead of the emperor in promising their aid in the impending war, and all were only too glad to take the handsome sums of money which Edward distributed right and left. A few trifling acts of authority in the name of his imperial master were not resisted; but further than this the loudly heralded imperial alliance did not go. In the desultory campaigning of the next few months the German allies made but a sorry showing. Ludwig the Bavarian, a shifty politician here as always, did nothing whatever to support his

grand promises, and Edward, fortunately for his cause, found himself thrown back upon the only true sources of his strength, upon English loyalty and English courage.

II.

~

WHILE DIPLOMACY BETWEEN THE GERMAN, the French, the papal, and the English courts was doing its utmost to avert the conflict or to line up the adversaries to the best advantage, Edward gathered his English forces for a decisive blow. It had been Philip's intention to carry the war into England, and with this in view he had taken elaborate measures to strengthen the French power at sea. A naval station was established at Rouen, agreements were made with Italian sea captains, notably with Genoese, to furnish contingents of ships and men, and a new administration of naval affairs was planned. The names of Doria, Grimaldi, and Fieschi, famous in the naval wars of the Mediterranean, reappear here in the service of France. The earliest ordinance regulating the movement of the French fleet dates from this time. During the years 1338 and 1339 repeated descents were made upon the English coast; towns were attacked, some small outlying places burned and considerable shipping destroyed, but so sturdy was the resistance of the English whenever a landing was effected that the French fleet was withdrawn and the attitude of offence changed to that of defence.

It was still a matter of uncertainty whether Edward would decide to strike the first blow in the North or in Guienne, but in either case it was of the utmost importance for him to have control of the English Channel. The account of this, the first great naval encounter in English history, as given by Froissart, shows the English to have been as clever in manipulating their fleet as they were brave in fighting, whereas the French, equally brave, were led into the fight without any well-considered plan. The ships on both sides, not materially different in build from ordinary merchantmen, carried from one to two hundred fighting men, and the object of all maneuvering was to pair them off against the ships of the enemy, so that the conditions of the fight might be brought as near as possible to those of a combat on land. The English seem to have come quite suddenly upon the French not far from the mouth of the Scheldt, near the village of Sluys, from which the battle takes its name. The French ships, about two hundred in number, had all been crowded together into a bend of the shore, so that the Genoese captain urged the admiral, Behuchet, to order them out into the open sea, lest the English should fall upon them as they were and destroy them at will. The admiral refused. The English in about equal force bore down upon them, but as they came near quite suddenly veered and seemed to be in full retreat. Then the French set sail in pursuit, but the English turning once more had now the advantage of sun, wind, and tide. In perfect order, a ship with men-at-arms flanked in every case by two others carrying archers, they met the French, and the fight, quite like a battle on land, broke up into a series of encounters, the object of which was to bring two ships to close quarters and hold them fast by grappling irons until one side or the other should gain the advantage in a hand-to-hand mêlée. King Edward was there in person, and the presence of many English ladies who were

on their way to join the queen in Flanders and who had to be protected by a special detachment of the fleet, seems to indicate that this expedition had been intended rather to transport troops for land service than to join battle at sea. The event proved, however, that this use of both men at arms and archers was the best that could have been made. The terrible English longbow, a weapon far superior to the mechanical crossbow, won here for the first time the fame which it was to sustain throughout the Hundred Years' War. Under cover of its deadly arrows the heavier ships with the men at arms were enabled to grapple with the enemy, and in spite of a desperate resistance, which prolonged the fight throughout the long June day, English valor finally prevailed. Of perhaps twenty thousand men on the French fleet barely five thousand escaped under cover of the dusk, and of these many were overtaken and destroyed on the following day. The English loss also was heavy, but the prestige of the victory at Sluys was of enormous value. It was a revelation at once of the power of the English people and of the quality of their young king. In a very strict sense of the word this was a national achievement. Henceforth the command of the sea was in English hands, the fear of invasion was banished, and the way was opened to carry the war into the enemy's country. It would seem to have been quite possible for King Edward to press straight on through the friendly Flanders and, using that country as a base, to dictate terms to Philip at Paris. But that was not the method of romantic warfare. To take too great advantage of an enemy's unpreparedness seemed to violate the rules of the great and honorable game of war. It was more in keeping with the code to sit down before the border fortress of Tournay and spend fruitless months in a vain attempt to take a prize that after all was hardly worth the cost. It was quite in harmony too with the chivalrous notions of the time that Edward and Philip should have made a personal issue of their quarrel and tried to arrange a single combat which should settle their rivalry once for all. The trouble with this scheme was that Edward would put down as his stake only his claim on the kingdom of France, while Philip insisted on staking kingdom against kingdom, and so nothing came of it. The interval between the campaign of Sluys and that of Crécy (1340-1346) is mainly occupied with the early stages of the war of succession in Brittany, a long-drawn conflict which forms the background to many of the incidents of the greater national struggle. The outward pretext of the Breton war was the question of a successor to Duke John III, who died in 1341 leaving no heir. The claimants were his brother, John of Montfort, and Charles of Blois, husband of Duke John's niece and himself a nephew of King Philip. The same point was made as in the case of the succession to the kingdom, that a woman could not inherit; but the futility of this pretext was shown by the fact that Philip in supporting the claim of Charles of Blois had to champion the very principle which would have excluded him from the throne. The truth was that Brittany included two regions very distinct as to population, an upper section bordering on lands of the French crown and a lower filled by a

people of Celtic origin, furiously tenacious of their local right and owning but the slightest loyalty to the French king. Upper, or French, Brittany supported the claim of Charles of Blois, backed by his uncle King Philip, while John of Montfort found his support among the true Bretons and in the alliance of King Edward. It was on a smaller scale a national question, and its value to Edward III in offering him another entrance into French politics is evident. The history of this secondary conflict is one of heroic feats of arms, of useless sacrifice of brave men and devoted women, but it concerns us only as it was utilized for larger purposes. Philip VI, treating the Bretons as traitors to his crown, permitted himself acts of violent repression that could not fail to arouse anew the spirit of revolt and throw the province only the more decidedly into the arms of England. Meanwhile in the south the policy of Philip was to encroach continually, little by little, upon the now comparatively narrow strip of territory left to England along the western coast. Taking advantage of the situation in Brittany, Edward declared war anew, and this time he chose Guienne as his point of attack. The summer of 1345 found the earl of Derby in the field at the head of a considerable force, and in a few months the hold of England in the south was restored and considerably extended without any very serious fighting. The following spring (1346) hostilities were reopened in the face of a greatly increased French army. The English leader threw himself into the very strong fortress of Aiguillon on the Garonne, where he was besieged in form by the whole French force under John of Normandy, afterward King John "the Good."

While the choicest troops in France were thus engaged in the south, King Edward improved the opportunity to land with a powerful army at La Hogue. Without resistance, under the best of conditions, through a country teeming with abundant harvests, he moved in leisurely fashion through Lower Normandy toward the left or southern bank of the Seine. At Caen he halted long enough to take and pillage the town, but was not tempted into a siege of its fortress. It appears to have been his plan to cross to the right bank of the river and make for his own territory of Ponthieu, but everywhere he found the bridges destroyed and was thus led on, up to the very gates of Paris. Evidently he did not trust himself to enter upon the chances of a siege, but repaired the bridge at Poissy and began a rapid march northward. It was a marvel at the time that Philip, who was all this while at Paris, whence he could see the smoke of his own burning villages, made not the slightest attempt to prevent the repairing of the Poissy bridge. He allowed the English to cross and to get well on their way northward before he set out with a large army to follow them. This famous race to Crécy was, on the English side, in the nature of a retreat. Edward III was driven, the more as he advanced, into a dangerous position between the sea, the lower course of the Somme in the neighborhood of Abbeville, and the line of the French army. Again he was anxious to cross a river, again he found the bridges and fords defended by the loyalty of the

inhabitants, and again he pulled himself through by the superior steadiness and discipline of his troops. Above all things he insisted upon close order, – no straggling and no hurrying.

The French on the other hand, now eager for a fight, pressed on by forced marches and came almost in touch with the retreating English. King Edward was apparently in a desperate strait, when suddenly he learned of a tidal ford below Abbeville. He waited for the fall of the tide, and then, pushing his men with all haste, got them across just as the advance of the French army came up. Meanwhile a French detachment had crossed above and hurried on to dispute the passage of the ford. They were, however, easily disposed of by the English archers, under cover of whose deadly fire the men at arms made their way across and secured the passage of the rest. King Edward's first move on finding himself in safety was to make a rapid detour westward, destroying everything in his way, until he came to his own land of Ponthieu. There he vowed he would stay and fight "if the king of France would come on, though he had ten times as strong a force as himself." And he ordered all his host to go to rest and to pray God to give them an honorable and a happy issue out of the affair.

The French army is represented as having spent a long time in getting itself into formation after crossing the river at Abbeville. In place of a compact and well-ordered host under a single leader and well in hand, we find here the usual jumble of feudal contingents, each under its own leader and each eager to prove itself better than the rest by some signal feat of daring. The king was advised to hold his army in check, to give them food and rest, and not to fight until the following day. The chronicler, Jean le Bel, says that this advice pleased the king and that he gave orders to withdraw the banners; but it was already too late. The barons pressing on, each fearing that some one might get into the fight before him, came in full sight of the English drawn up in fair order near the village of Crécy. This was too much for them. When they heard the king's order to draw back "no one of the lords was willing to give way unless those in the advance would turn back first, and those in the advance would not turn back for shame, but held their place without moving." Thus the knights were more and more crowded together in "pride and rivalry but without order." Then the troops of light foot soldiery, the Genoese crossbowmen, and the Spanish *bidoux* armed with darts, pike, and dagger, worn out as they were by the forced march from Abbeville, were brought by their captains in front of the knights and crowded forward by these until they were so near that the English archers began to shoot them down and drive them back upon the French horsemen. According to all rule the horsemen ought to have opened a way for the bowmen to pass through their ranks and re-form for a new attack, but as the king saw his archers give way, he and those about him cried out: "Down with this rabble! They are crowding upon us and getting in our way to no purpose." So these valiant knights charged upon their own foot soldiers and thus found themselves in a hopeless tangle of men and horses

under the pitiless fire of the English longbowmen. It was rather a slaughter than a battle. Every arrow told on man or horse. The English men at arms, dismounted from their horses, awaited the assault. The first attack was upon the "battle" of young Edward, Prince of Wales, who won his spurs in a desperate encounter. The French army broke up into its feudal units and fought with infinite bravery but without leadership or plan. The episode of the blind king, John of Bohemia, whose place was at the other end of Europe, but who was here with a group of knightly followers enjoying the game of war, is characteristic of the time. When he heard that the fight was on and going badly, he begged his attendants to lead him forward far enough so that he might strike one good blow at the English. So they drew up about him, bound the bridles of their horses together with his, and charged pell-mell into the English ranks. The old king, true type of the mediæval fighting ruler, had his desire. Not one blow only but three or four he had the joy of striking before he was himself stricken down, he and all his troop but two squires, who lived to tell the tale to Jean Froissart, who has told it to us.

From late afternoon until far into the dusk of the August day similar charges of French horse were hurled against the English line only to be thrown back with cruel loss. All through the fight the English never moved from their position. Their action was directed from one point by the king in person. As night fell they were ordered to rest where they had fought, and only when the morning broke was the extent of their victory known. The French army was literally cut to pieces. It had engaged without waiting for the communal troops from the "good cities" to come up, and these were found next day in camp, ignorant of what had happened, and were scattered with heavy loss. King Philip, whose horse had been shot under him, riding through the night, was brought to a place of safety. The French loss, as given by Froissart from reports of actual count, was eleven great lords of the realm, eighty-three barons, and twelve hundred knights, besides thirty thousand foot! The English were said to have lost not a single knight, but this is highly improbable. Their victory was a triumph of steadiness and discipline over undisciplined and disorganized bravery. Behind it lay the spirit of English nationality, giving order and unity to every action.

The immediate sequel to the battle of Crécy was the siege of Calais, by far the most important point on the northern coast of France and indispensable to England if her claims to French territory were to be maintained. The defence of Calais is one of the most heroic incidents of the war, or indeed of all wars. It shows a spirit strikingly in contrast with that of the French government, and helps us to understand why the great national struggle was so long-drawn-out. So far King Edward had avoided the costly delays of a siege, but now, as soon as his army at Crécy could be moved, he led it before Calais and began the investment of the place in regular form. The situation of Calais made all thought of an assault impossible. Close to the sea, at the mouth of a small river,

surrounded by a double tide-moat, and protected on the land side by the shifting sands, it could have repulsed any attack possible to the art of war of that day. Nothing remained for Edward, therefore, but to starve it out. He had command of the sea and counted upon the depression of the French to secure him by land. In this latter hope he was not disappointed. The English army settled into winter quarters, built a regular town with an open market twice a week, and by ranging pretty widely was able to keep open its communication with Flanders and to draw subsistence from a wide extent of country. On the sea there was more difficulty. It is true the English had no regular French fleet to fear, but the hardy sailors of Normandy and Picardy were able to elude them and during the first six months of the siege were continually slipping through their rather loose blockade and supplying the brave citizens with food. Meanwhile many a doughty deed of arms was performed between the city and the invading host, but no change came in the situation, except that King Edward was drawing tighter and tighter the lines of the blockade. The final link in the chain of investment was formed by a great wooden tower built close to the harbor entrance and equipped with *canons, d'espringalles et d'archiers*, so that nothing could enter or leave without being destroyed. This may have been the first case of the use of cannon in warfare, though the missiles used may have been only combustibles, not stones. Meanwhile King Philip, in safety at Amiens, was doing nothing. Not until the early summer of 1347 was he so far aroused by the piteous appeals of the starving men of Calais as to send out his summons for an army to go to their relief. The response seems to have been surprisingly prompt. If we may believe Froissart, two hundred thousand men joined the royal banner and moved in the month of July direct toward Calais, arriving on the 27th at Sandgate, a slight eminence two leagues from the beleaguered city. The citizens could see them from the walls and believed that their relief had come. Edward had made his preparations by fortifying the surrounding downs and guarding the one bridge by which the French could approach. On the other side, toward the north, a great force of Flemish had responded to his call and had advanced as far as Gravelines. Philip had not recovered from the bitter lesson of Crécy. He sent messengers to Edward with this high-sounding challenge:

“The King of France sends us to you to say that he has come hither and is waiting at Sandgate Hill to fight with you, but can find no way to come at you. He greatly desires to relieve his good city of Calais and so has had his people inquire and see how he may come to you; but it is an impossible thing. He would be glad if you would appoint commissioners to meet with his and set a place where we may fight. And this he charges us to say and demand.”

The king of England, when he had heard these words, was straightway counseled and advised to reply as follows:

“Sirs! I have well heard all that you demand of me from my adversary, who wrongfully keeps from me my heritage. Tell him from me, if you will, that I am

here, where I have been for nearly a year. He has known this all the time, and might have come sooner if he had chosen; but he has let me stay here so long that it has cost me dear, and now I believe I shall soon be master of the town and castle of Calais. I have no intention of suiting his convenience and his ease and giving up what I believe I have conquered after so long desiring it. Tell him if he and his cannot come by this road they may look about till they find one." Legates from Pope Clement VI, passing back and forth between the camps, were able to secure a truce of only three days, which King Edward characteristically improved by strengthening his intrenchments. Then the anxious watchers on the walls saw the French banners scattering and the great army breaking up in all directions without striking a blow.

The fate of Calais was sealed. Summoned to surrender at discretion, the citizens begged of King Edward terms suited to their courage and their misfortunes. He at first refused to treat with them, but was persuaded to accept six of their number to be dealt with as he pleased, the rest to be spared. Six noble citizens were found, who volunteered for this desperate service. They were led before the king barefooted, bareheaded, clad only in their shirts, and with ropes about their necks. The young king made as if nothing could turn him from his purpose to have their lives as part payment for all the losses of that costly year. The barons begged him to be merciful, but he held firm until his queen, Philippa of Hainault, threw herself at his feet and said: "Ah! My dear lord! Since I crossed the sea, in great peril as you know, I have never asked a favor of you. Now I beg and pray you humbly as a gift to me, by the blessed Mary's son and for love of me, that you have mercy on these six men." The king waited a little space before he answered and looked upon the good lady his wife, who was great with child and was weeping piteously before him on her knees, and his heart was softened, for he was loath to cross her in her condition, and when he spoke he said: "Ha! Lady! I would you were somewhere else than here! You beg so that I dare not withhold the gift you ask, and, loath though I am to do it – there! I give them to you. Do with them as you will." The six pledges were saved and sent on into France where they were provided for by the government. The inhabitants of Calais were driven out wholesale and replaced by English settlers. Calais thus became, and for two hundred years remained, an English town, a thorn in the side of France and a continual reminder to England of claims that with every generation, as the national sentiment strengthened, were growing less worth the having.

III.

~

THE EIGHT YEARS BETWEEN THE campaign of Crécy-Calais and the campaign of Poitiers were occupied by both France and England in preparations for a conflict which both felt to be inevitable. Truces were made and from time to time extended; but they were little observed. The war in Brittany was hardly interrupted, and in the south the continual attempts of the French crown to assert rights over lands claimed by England were an endless source of bitterness. The internal policy of Philip VI, his persistent determination to enforce the rights of the crown against clerical and feudal privilege, his heavy taxation, all tended to weaken his government as against a determined foreign enemy. The monarchy was indeed gaining, but Philip of Valois was not the man to utilize for great national ends the vast resources of the country. At his death in 1350 the all important question of the English war was as far from settlement as ever.

The accession of John, the eldest son of Philip VI, confirmed the Valois dynasty, but changed nothing for the better. John's surname, *le Bon*, expresses his character. He was emphatically the "good fellow," popular in the sense of making himself well liked when he would, but without persistence of purpose; "honorable" in the feudal meaning of the word, but insensible to the obligations of business honesty; brave in his own person, but incapable of leadership at a crisis when the one thing most needed was to concentrate the whole strength of the state upon the national defence; hopelessly lacking in largeness of view and in command of himself. Over against this "good" king appears the "bad" Charles, king of Navarre, count of Évreux and lord of other wide estates in Normandy, a direct descendant in two lines from St. Louis and distinctly the ablest politician in France. His restless ambition aimed at nothing less than the French crown, and he became the center of a series of conspiracies, chiefly in the north, which fully occupied the opening years of King John's reign. The succession of blackguardly murders and royal reprisals reads more like the story of an Italian *tyrannis* than like the record of a well-ordered state. Our interest in it lies only in the reaction upon the English question. The renewal of the great war was the direct consequence of the action of King John against Charles of Navarre, who called in Edward III of England to his aid in Normandy.

As in the campaign of 1346, so now it was not clear until the last moment whether the decisive action was to be in the north or in the south. The defence of Guienne was intrusted to Edward, the "Black" Prince of Wales, who had won his spurs at Crécy and now, as a youth of twenty-six, was displaying exceptional military capacity. The campaign of 1355 was little more than one continuous raid through the fertile lands of Languedoc. Its object was simply destruction, in order that the resources of the country might not be used against the English in the following year. It was in all respects parallel to the raiding of King Edward through Normandy in 1346, and it was equally successful. When the

Black Prince went into winter quarters at Bordeaux he left behind him a desolated country, worth little to his enemies, but far from being won to the English cause. It was good warfare, but bad statesmanship.

Meanwhile King John, at his wits' end for resources to meet the coming attack, was suffering the pains of negotiating for support with his bourgeois subjects. The Estates-General of the North, the Languedoil, which now for more than a generation had been gaining in consciousness of their power, were willing to help the king, but only upon terms that must have seemed to him derogatory to his royal right. More and more clearly comes out the distinction between the monarchy and the nation. The Estates were loyal to France, but profoundly and with right distrusted the king. They were willing to approve a general tax, provided they could be assured that it would be honestly collected from all classes of the people and applied directly to its purpose; namely, the maintenance of an army for the national defence. To this end the Estates constituted themselves a permanent financial check upon the king, with their own officials to superintend the collection of the tax and its application to the purpose intended. They provided for regular future meetings and for the probable outbreak of new wars. They were really nothing less than a Committee of the National Defence, made necessary by the imminence of the danger and the incapacity of the king to adjust himself to the demands of a new time.

For the moment there was nothing for the king but to yield. He accepted everything, relying doubtless on his expected success in war and the imperfect organization of the "constitutionalist" party to clear himself of all unpleasant restraints. In the early spring of 1356 similar measures, displaying the same distrust of the king, were passed by the Estates of Languedoc. In neither case, however, were the Estates well supported by the country. The mediæval view of taxation as something imposed from above by a superior power rather than as a pledge of citizenship was not to be overcome for many a long day yet. King John was indeed in a hard place. If he could have turned without reserve to face the danger in the south, he might have captured or beaten the small force at the disposal of Prince Edward. He chose rather to meet what doubtless seemed the worse evil, the revolt of Normandy under the lead, open or secret, of Charles of Navarre. Instead of paying their dues to the officials of the Estates for the support of a national army, several Norman leaders broke openly with the king. John was not lacking in personal bravery. At Rouen, where his son, the Dauphin Charles, had invited Charles of Navarre to dine, he presented himself at the table with a following strong enough to arrest the chiefs of the conspiracy and to take the heads of several before any resistance could be made. The spectacle of the king of France shaking his royal brother of Navarre about the room by the hair, while a Navarrese squire strikes him in the breast with a dagger, is not an edifying one, but it was the kind of feat that, in lack of the deeper sentiments of loyalty, might decide the fate of kingdoms. Lower

Normandy was thrown upon the English side, and English troops ravaged the province again as far as the town of Verneuil.

King John stood in Upper Normandy with an army of perhaps fifty thousand men, when news came that the Black Prince had left Bordeaux (July, 1356) and was on his way northward to join the English forces in Normandy. From Bordeaux the young prince moved in a direct line towards Orléans on the Loire, spending more than a month on the way and crossing at least a dozen water courses without opposition or loss. When nearly at Orléans he learned that King John with a very strong force was coming southward from Chartres; and, turning westward, he struck the Loire near Tours. He did not cross the river, but turned southward again and began a rapid march back to his "own" country. It was the story of the march to Crécy over again; only that this time the French won the race and succeeded in turning the English position, so that the prince found himself near Poitiers, well placed indeed, if fight he must, but little desiring to fight. His army was not above eight thousand men. That of the French may have been four or five times as large. At the last moment, after two cardinals in the name of the pope had exhausted every means to bring about a truce, young Edward had determined to retreat and had already moved two of his three "battles" across a stream, when the third under the earl of Salisbury was attacked by the French advance. Seeing that it was now too late to retreat, the prince called back his men, and so admirable was the English discipline that they re-formed and arrived in time to meet the French assault.

On the French side the same causes produced the same results as at Crécy. Horsemen were sent forward within range of the English bowmen, horses became unmanageable, and heavily armed men were sacrificed without a chance to show what they could do. Then, following the English example, men at arms dismounted and came into the fight on foot but unprotected by archers, and the English, taking advantage of this moment, mounted and charged. Prodiges of valor were performed on both sides, and the loss was far more evenly divided than at Crécy. King John holding in reserve his "battle," more numerous, it was said, than the whole English host, at last brought it into the fray, but in vain. Nothing could break the steady discipline of the English, and as, one after another, his chief followers fell around him or deserted the field, there was no escape but death or surrender. Again it had been demonstrated that the heart of the French people was not yet in this war.

The captivity of King John, his transportation to England, and the negotiations for his release are of importance to the national cause only as giving to the sole remaining element of unity in the state, the Estates-General, its opportunity to show what it could do. As before, they were called upon to provide first of all for the national defence, and that meant first money, but also it meant leadership. The history of the Estates of 1356-1357 is one of the most important chapters in the story not merely of the French nation but of government by the people throughout Europe. Nowhere in the early records of

parliamentary government is there a more impressive picture of a popular representation coming together with entire comprehension of what needed to be done and apparently with the amplest resources and the best intentions to do it. Nowhere is there a more dismal record of failure to grasp the real nature of the problem, to see that what gives security to any government must be some solid element of the people willing to stand by it and work with it. Such an element the feudal monarchy – as far as it went – had found in the great military and landed aristocracy. The question in France in 1356-1357 was whether the new financial state was going to find a similar support in the rising power of the industrial and trading classes. Would those classes take their place as loyal supporters of the Valois monarchy and help it to drive the foreigner from their shores?

The answer seemed at first likely to be favorable. Under the lead of a remarkable man, Étienne Marcel, *prévôt des marchands*, the chief of the Parisian bourgeoisie, the Estates rose for the moment to the height of their great opportunity. In a series of notable enactments they provided for a new levy of troops and for money to pay them. They began negotiations with the Dauphin and with Charles of Navarre on the basis of a permanent share in the administration of government to be given the Estates. Regular meetings with well-defined powers seemed to promise them a leadership in national affairs distinctly more effective than that of the Parliament in England. It was, however, precisely on the administrative side that the weakness of the Estates was most pronounced. As a check on the monarchy they might prove its salvation. As a substitute for it they were limited by an entire lack of traditions and by the pressure of a social order as far as possible from sympathizing with them. From an early moment in their brief career it became evident to their leaders that they could accomplish results only with the help of the monarchy, and the visible representative of the monarchy was the young Charles, later to be known as Charles the Clever (*le Sage*). The first aim of the Estates was to force him to take the head of affairs with advisers of their choosing. Their method was rude but, for the moment, effective. Marcel, at the head of an ever-ready Parisian mob, burst into the Dauphin's palace and murdered before his eyes the two counselors on whose advice he was relying. Then, acting in harmony with Charles of Navarre, who was looking for his own profit in the distress of the Valois, they persuaded the Dauphin to take the title of Regent and thus to give royal sanction to their acts. For about a month the clever youth allowed himself to remain under the tutelage of the bourgeoisie, then slipped quietly out of Paris and began that appeal to French loyalty which was to become the keynote of the regeneration of the monarchy and the making of the nation.

One is vividly reminded of the French Revolution and the Paris Commune as one reads of the Dauphin's dread of Paris and his summons to the Estates to meet him at Compiègne. It was a very meager gathering, quite without the

glowing enthusiasm of the former meetings, but it came halfway to meet the Dauphin's plans. Meanwhile occurred that frightful outbreak of the peasantry of the Île de France known in history as the "Jacquerie," from the word "Jacques," the ordinary nickname of the peasant. For a time it seemed as if the Parisian bourgeoisie acting with the Jacquerie might effect a practical overturn of society in the whole region of which Paris is the natural center, but the result, inevitable when the forces of social disorder are let loose without a definite constructive program, was not long delayed. The forces of order rallied and with reprisals no less savage than the outrages which had called them forth wiped out the stain upon the honor of their class with the blood of their fellow countrymen. In this reaction Marcel also met his fate. His nominal position was that of defender of Paris in the name of the Dauphin, but to strengthen himself he had entered into a fatal alliance with Charles of Navarre, the evil genius of every cause he touched, ambitious only to advance his own interests and never forgetting his "claim" on the throne of France. In June, 1358, Charles was made captain general of Paris and admitted troops of English soldiers into the city. It seems hardly doubtful that he had in mind the chance of capturing the Dauphin and, supported by Paris and the English, of proclaiming himself king. The Dauphin gathered a considerable force outside the city, prepared for a siege, and probably had his emissaries within the walls working quietly to gain adherents. This was the situation when Marcel, making the round of the gates at night, was set upon by a troop evidently well prepared and was murdered, a victim, like Artavelde, of a force he had set in motion but was powerless to control. Like every leader of revolution he was expected to show in a moment results that need generations of training to accomplish. In the scheme of French politics as they were in 1357 there was no room for such a man except as the counselor of a monarchy wise enough to employ him, and such a monarchy did not exist.

While France was thus being torn in pieces by friend and foe alike, the excellent John Valois was enjoying his captivity in London as became a gentleman and a prince. There is little to indicate that he was anything but delighted to be out of the wretched snarl into which his own incapacity had helped to bring the government of his country. His attitude, if he had one, is well shown by the disgraceful treaty to which he agreed in March, 1359, and which was sent over into France to be ratified by the Dauphin and the barons. According to this treaty King Edward was to receive in full sovereignty most of the ancient possessions of the English crown in France, both north and south of the Loire, amounting to about one half of the French territory, besides Calais and the surrounding country and the overlordship of Brittany. An enormous money indemnity was to repay England for the expenses of the war. It is to the eternal honor of all concerned that the Dauphin, the Estates, and even Charles of Navarre, who saw himself likely to fall between two stools, united in repudiating so shameful an abandonment of the French cause. It was far too

high a price to pay for getting back their worthless king.

English Raid of 1359-1360 Edward, on his side, had his preparations made, and, hearing that the treaty had failed, "he cried out, so that all could hear, that before winter he would come into the kingdom of France with such a power that he could stay there until he should either make an end of the war or bring about a peace to his own honor." He was as good as his word. The army which in October, 1359, gathered about him at Calais was the most formidable host as yet brought over. It was not merely a fighting army, but was provided with every resource for a prolonged winter campaign. The first objective point was the strong city of Rheims, but on a show of resistance all attempt to take the place was abandoned, and the English army, unmolested by any enemy, passed on towards Upper Burgundy. The winter was spent there, and in the spring, after making most advantageous terms with the duke of Burgundy, the king turned to the northwest again and moved his army into the neighborhood of Paris. It was now past the middle of April. The English force had made another of the great marches which, no less than the battles it had won, had given proof of its quality; but it had made no permanent gains of any sort. The government at Paris had let it wear itself out in this heart-breaking fashion without stirring hand or foot, and even now, with the enemy at the gates, refused to come out and fight. The news from England was disquieting; a siege of Paris was out of the question; envoys of the Church were unceasing in their efforts to make peace, – Edward III decided to negotiate.

The outcome of these negotiations was the Treaty of Bregtigny, one of the landmarks in this long national struggle. Its terms were a considerable modification of the London agreement between the two kings, but secured a great extension of the actual English holdings in France. King Edward was to hold practically all the land along the western coast from the Loire to the border of Navarre and stretching eastward about halfway across the country. Many feudal lordships bordering on these territories were transferred in their allegiance from France to England. In the far north Ponthieu and Calais were secured to England in perpetuity. King John was to be released at once in return for an indemnity of three million gold crowns. King Edward renounced all claim on the ancient territories of the house of Anjou north of the Loire. France was to give up her alliance with Scotland, and England was to renounce her agreements with Flanders. The first generation of the Hundred Years' War had thus resulted in the bitter humiliation of France, a result directly traceable to her lack of unity and sense of national honor. Even the hard terms of the Peace of Bretigny were received at Paris with extravagant joy, so utterly was the country's power of resistance broken down. Here and there sparks of a true national feeling blazed up in revolt against this surrender to a foreign power, and naturally there was long delay in bringing together the first installments of the ransom money and in collecting the hostages who were to be left in England as pledges of the fulfillment of the treaty. King John had been brought

over to Calais, where the two kings passed a jovial fortnight while the main terms of the treaty were being ratified, many details as to renunciations, however, being left for further elaboration within the year. The actual occupation of the surrendered territories showed the folly of the policy by which the English had gained them. The cruel raids throughout the south had left in the inhabitants, notably in those of the cities, a bitter resentment against the foreigner. Demands for the surrender of their keys were met in many cases with obstinate delay and even here and there with a show of resistance. It was not until four years later, and then after a vigorous demonstration in the country by the Prince of Wales, that the feudatories of Guienne could be brought to acknowledge the English sovereignty.

In all this we may see, if we will, the signs of a national sentiment stronger in disaster than in prosperity. This sentiment, however, was far from attaching itself to the fortunes of the released but not yet ransomed king. In fact this incident of the Treaty of Bretigny was of importance only as adding another burden to the exhausted country. In vain were the people called upon to redeem the engagements of their useless sovereign. The money for the ransom came in but slowly, and, what was worse, instead of paying his debt of honor, this "good" king so frittered away what did come in that by the beginning of 1364 he was a million crowns in arrears with no prospect of making up the deficit. Fortunately, alike for himself and the country, a pretext was offered for relieving France of its worst encumbrance. The four princes of the blood who were serving as his hostages in England had grown more and more impatient at the slow progress of events. After about two years they made arrangements with King Edward by which they were to receive their liberty in return for still further concessions and were allowed to return as far as Calais, where they were left on parole with considerable freedom of movement. One of the king's sons, that same Louis of Anjou whom we meet in many adventures in southern Italy, broke his parole and escaped. The noble king, feeling that his son "had greatly stained the honor of the king and of his lineage," made the one sensible decision of his life, handed over the government to his other son, the clever Charles, and went back merrily to his English "prison." There he died three months later with all the obligations of his life still unfulfilled. The problem for France was whether her governing classes could unite upon a policy which would frankly recognize that the old feudal order of society was changing and would build up a new structure to take its place.

The answer to this problem is found in the policy of Charles V (1364-1380), and the person who more than any other typifies the spirit and the needs of the new time is Bertrand du Guesclin. Above all things it was necessary that the material resources of the country, its men and its money, should be brought into the service of the government. This meant heavy taxation, but it had been abundantly shown that France, in spite of all exhaustion, had money enough if only it could be honestly applied to her crying needs, and men enough if only

they could be made to work together for a common end. These were the lines along which the rehabilitation of France was to be undertaken. First, the necessities of the country were plainly perceived by a clear-sighted monarch, and then men and measures were found to relieve them. It is plain from the outset that the government of Charles V had no intention whatever of observing the terms of the Treaty of Bretigny any further than was absolutely necessary, and there were loopholes enough left in that document to give them ready means of escape. Especially was this true in regard to the so-called "renunciations" of sovereignty in the surrendered territories. Even an actual occupation by an armed force under an English governor did not suffice so long as the legal title to the land was wanting in this particular form of guaranty. At any moment the people of a district might declare themselves to be unlawfully in English hands and unite in favor of France. In fact, this is just what happened in many cases. Charles V was a master in apparent inaction. He liked above all the policy of letting things go until they should right themselves, meanwhile, however, watching every opportunity to strengthen his hold on the allegiance of his subjects. Compared with his father and his grandfather, he is the very model of a modern as contrasted with a mediæval king. Not a soldier, – he had according to all accounts run away, or at least "retired," from the battle at Poitiers, – he knew how to employ soldiers to the best advantage. Instead of relying, as his predecessors had done, upon a rabble of knightly adventurers more eager to perform "feats of arms" than to win battles, he began from the first to make use of the mass of fighting material which, under the form of the "Free Companies," had settled itself upon France.

The first great relief came with the settlement of the succession in Brittany. In the first year of Charles's reign, after twenty-three years of struggle, the extreme Breton party of the Montforts gained a decisive victory over the French party of the Blois at Aurai. It was a victory of the English sympathizers, and it was won largely with English arms; but the result was wholly favorable to France. Negotiation secured what war had failed to gain, and Jean de Montfort became not only duke of Brittany but also a vassal of the king of France.

The disposal of the Free Companies was a matter of great difficulty. Fortunately affairs in Spain shaped themselves so that King Charles V was naturally led to take part in them, and he improved the occasion to charge Du Guesclin with the task of enlisting an army from the Companies. The relief was, however, but temporary. A first success was followed by later reverses, Du Guesclin was made prisoner by the English allies of Pedro of Castile, and all the evils of an uncertain peace were let loose upon the South. Events were moving rapidly towards a rupture of the Treaty of Bretigny. One of Charles's first cares was to secure himself by a series of important alliances. King Edward had by the treaty formally renounced his close union with Flanders, which had been of such decisive service to England during the first stage of the war. He had, however, succeeded in arranging a marriage between his son Edmund, Earl of

Cambridge, and his cousin Margaret, daughter of Count Louis of Flanders. The necessary dispensations had been obtained from the pope, and the marriage arrangements were approaching completion, when Charles V put in a demand for the hand of Margaret for his own brother, Philip of Burgundy. The complaisant pope, Urban V, was persuaded to revoke his dispensations, the engaged pair were released from their engagement, and, in spite of an obstinate resistance on the part of Count Louis of Flanders, this Flemish- Burgundian marriage, one of the most momentous in its consequences in all European history, was celebrated at Ghent (June 19, 1369). The Valois monarchy had won a momentary diplomatic victory only to raise up against itself in the house of Burgundy the most implacable of enemies.

On the south the internal conflict in Castile brought about a valuable alliance between Charles V and the successful claimant, Henry of Trastamare, who also drew in King Ferdinand of Portugal as a third party in the union. This gave Charles a constant and support in the rear of the English in Guienne, especially valuable along the seacoast, where naval operations were likely to play an important part in the approaching struggle. In Germany Charles V secured himself by a treaty with the Luxemburg-Bohemian emperor Charles IV, thus reversing the situation as it had been at the first outbreak of the war. Finally, Charles V showed his superiority over his predecessors by raising to the post of Constable of France – that is, to the chief military command – the one man who had shown himself worthy of the honor, the rough Breton gentleman, Bertrand du Guesclin.

The formal declaration of war was justified by a purely national pretext. During the year 1368 many barons of Gascony, tired of their relations with England, formally applied to King Charles to receive them into his allegiance. Charles bided his time until he felt sure of his support and then cited the Prince of Wales to appear before him at Paris in May, 1369, as his vassal, on the ground that King John had not renounced the sovereignty in Guienne but had only left it in abeyance for further discussion. This was the question of the “renunciations” on a great scale. When Prince Edward had read the citation, he cried out: “Gladly will I come to Paris, since the king of France commands it; but I will come with helmet on my head and sixty thousand men at my back!” It was an idle boast, for from the very outset the fortune of war was with the French. The recovery of the South and West was as rapid as had been their loss. Within a few months town after town had changed hands, and by the end of 1370 the Prince of Wales, instead of dictating terms in Paris, was sailing home, broken in health and spirit, to his early death. North of the Loire things went somewhat better for the English cause. The raiding policy of the previous stage of the war was renewed, but without permanent result. By the king’s order the French shut themselves up in the strong places and let the raid go by until it wore itself out. Even such doughty blades as Du Guesclin and Clisson approved this policy: “Better a country pillaged than a country lost!” Only from time to

time and under favorable circumstances did the cautious cabinet of Charles V venture upon some bolder demonstration. Thus year after year the war, now become, as it seemed, a permanent incident of French life, dragged itself on. The old antagonisms revived.

Charles of Navarre continued to play his old game of treasonable intrigue until finally, after the failure of a plot to poison the king, his lands in Normandy were declared confiscated to the crown and definitely occupied by the French government. Navarre itself was mortgaged to the king of Castile to pay the cost of Charles's numerous wars. He died in 1387, infamous to all time, the most extreme type of the great landed prince of the transition period, no longer content with the limitations of the heroic days of the feudal state and not yet adjusted to the duties and responsibilities of modern nationalism.

Still more significant were the events in Brittany. Here too an intense local patriotism had yielded only with great reluctance to the terms of the Treaty of Bretigny. The land was a continual entrance way for England into the heart of France. Late in 1378 Duke John of Montfort was cited before king and Parlement, duly tried and convicted of felony, and his lands declared forfeited to the crown of France. It was one thing, however, to decree and another thing to execute. The men to whom the king had to intrust the process of execution, Du Guesclin at their head, were mainly Bretons and, even without suspicion of disloyalty to him, were slow to attack the Breton forces which rallied about their beloved duke. Nothing decisive could be done, and it was to be generations yet before Brittany could be effectively united to the crown of France.

The "sage" king had not long to enjoy the fruits of his prudent policy. He died in 1380 without bringing the English question to any definite solution. He had succeeded in bringing most of the territory of France back into nominal allegiance to the crown, but this was only a first step toward making it actually subject to French government. The king's death raised a new set of problems which were to occupy the governing classes in France for a generation to come. The heir to the throne was a boy of twelve, a pitiful little figure, doomed from the start to a life of physical and mental misery. He stood for a monarchy that was really in the hands of a group of royal princes united only in the one purpose of making all the capital they could out of their commission as regents of the kingdom. The best security for the integrity of the French territory was the hardly less distracted state of England. King Edward III had died three years before (1377) and was succeeded by his grandson Richard II, a boy of eleven, whose uncertain hold upon the throne was an effectual bar to any vigorous foreign policy. In both countries the most imminent peril was civil war. In France the guardianship of the king was in the hands, first of his uncle, Louis of Anjou, and then of his two uncles, Philip of Burgundy and the duke of Bourbon, his mother's brother. The third brother of the late king, the duke of Berry, was given the administration of Languedoc and Guienne.

A Council of Twelve, including the four uncles, was to have the direct administration of the business of the crown. The first years of the reign of Charles VI were a time of popular disturbance in many directions. In England occurred the great industrial uprising of 1381 under the lead of John Ball and Wat Tyler, and similar disturbances broke out in the following year throughout France, both north and south. Doubtless profound economic changes were at the root of this widespread discontent, but the reaction upon political life was none the less evident and prompt. The remedy in every case was sought in a strengthening of the royal power and an increasing emphasis on the national interest. For a considerable period each of the great parties to the Hundred Years' War was too much occupied with these internal problems to give much thought to the larger question of national rivalry. Only after the suppression by the harshest measures of these popular demonstrations was it possible to return once more to the idea of a foreign war.

This time it was France that took the aggressive. Under the lead of the king's uncle, Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy and now, since the death of his father-in-law in 1384, count of Flanders, by far the most important attempt ever made at an invasion of England was set in motion during the year 1386. From every quarter of France, even from the far south, contingents of men and supplies of money poured into Flanders during the autumn. A fleet said to have numbered sixteen hundred sail was gathered at the port of Sluys and provided with every kind of apparatus, even to a sort of portable wooden town for winter quarters. The young king came in person, full of spirit, apparently looking forward with joy to the expedition, and the young princes of the blood could hardly contain their eagerness to be the first to touch the shore of England. Only the duke of Berry failed. In response to continued appeals he finally left the South and journeyed in leisurely fashion by way of Paris, arriving at Sluys just as the bad weather of the early winter set in. Meanwhile a foolish attempt had been made by the Constable of France with a fleet of sixty-two ships to make a landing at the mouth of the Thames. Heavy winds scattered the fleet, drove some vessels into the river, where they were captured by the English, and others on the coast of Zeeland, while only a broken remnant wandered back to Sluys. It is a curious story of mingled energy and timidity. The duke of Berry, upon his arrival, began to represent to the king the great dangers of even a successful landing in England. It was a hard and barren country, of which they, the French, were totally ignorant. A small force of Englishmen on their own soil could repel a much stronger invading army. It would be better to give up now than to risk all this splendid armament. On the other hand, the duke of Burgundy declared it would be a mortal disgrace to France to withdraw now after such great preparations; but his counsels were not heard and, in short, nothing was done. The several contingents were allowed to return home to add to the dangerous fighting material with which France was already overburdened, and another failure was added to the long list of French aggressive undertakings. A renewed

effort in the following spring was defeated by the internal conflicts of Brittany. At every point it was growing more and more evident that the divided leadership under which France was suffering would prevent effective action in any direction. Especially it was becoming clear that a deep-seated antagonism was developing between the new Burgundian power and the other branches of the Valois family. Already the lands of Burgundy extended in an almost unbroken curve from the valley of the Rhône to the mouths of the Rhine and the Scheldt. A daughter of Duke Philip the Bold was married to an Austrian prince whose lands in western Switzerland bordered upon the Burgundian territory. Another daughter and a son were married (1385) to a son and a daughter of the Bavarian house of Wittelsbach, whose territories lay along the lower Meuse and Rhine. It was only natural that the ancient dream of a middle state between France and Germany, connecting the Mediterranean with the North Sea, touching England at one end and Italy at the other, should revive once more under the lead of a family of princes strong enough to hold the balance between the Great Powers.

A check seemed to be put to these and other rival ambitions, when, rather suddenly, on the completion of his twentieth year, the young King Charles summoned his court to Rheims and there, with all formality, having duly thanked his loving uncles for their care of the kingdom, declared that henceforth he would govern for himself. In vain the princes protested and sought at least compensation in lands for their recent heavy outlays. They were allowed to retire to their estates, and Charles VI proceeded to reform the administration on the lines followed by his father. Especially he sought to fill the offices of the kingdom with "new men" of talent, a type which came to be known in derision as "Marmousets." In the course of two years important steps were taken toward securing a unified and capable management of the crown finances and judicial administration. The personal hold of the king on the provinces was demonstrated in a series of royal progresses. His young brother, Louis of Orléans, was betrothed to Valentina Visconti, daughter of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, lord of Milan, while the momentary success of Louis of Anjou in southern Italy, acting in harmony with the French pope, Clement, seemed to open up an indefinite prospect of French expansion in the peninsula. The national spirit was once more rallying about a government that was seeking to deserve its loyalty, when, with hardly a warning, the fatality of those who put their trust in princes overtook the peoples of France. In the year 1392 the young king, it is uncertain from what cause, fell a victim to a violent form of epileptic madness. It was the misfortune of France that this malady was not continuous enough to justify a permanent regency, which might have fixed upon a settled policy. It was to be thirty years yet before death was to put an end to the alternations of sanity and madness which opened the way for continual vacillations of policy and, what was worse yet, for the unbounded ambitions of a troop of rival princes, the scourge of France. "Woe to the land

whose king is a child!" but worse yet is the fate of that land whose king is a fool. It was especially sad for France that in the multitude of her councilors the king in his lucid intervals was the only one who seemed to be actuated by a true sentiment of national honor. In those brief moments, growing unhappily less and less frequent, the cause of order and justice could at least be heard. At other times the only point on which the princes who stood for government were united was that the people were to be ground down to the last penny, in order that they, the princes, might enjoy life. It is a period of surface brilliancy, when splendid castles were built and a life of luxury was lived with every adornment of taste and refinement, such as only the Italian city-states could parallel.

The period of French history from 1392 to 1413 is best described as that of the Burgundian-Orléans rivalry, or, as it is more generally called, the Burgundian-Armagnac contest for the control of the government. At the head of the Orléans party was the king's brother Louis, husband of the Italian Valentina Visconti, intimate friend of the queen Isabella, the Bavarian woman upon whose head Frenchmen have united in visiting the evils they were powerless to prevent. This Louis of Orléans was the type of the gay cavalier and courtier, without a larger thought than his own political advantage. Over against him stood, since the death of Duke Philip the Bold of Burgundy in 1404, this Philip's son, John the Fearless, a rough, determined fighting man, lord of a great territory and ready to utilize France for the ends of Burgundian aggrandizement. As between these two dominant factions it is hard to see any distinction that means very much. Neither had any real support in any permanent element of the state. If either, perhaps the Burgundian party was the more generally popular at Paris, which was now coming to be more than ever before the center of French political life. We discern certain furious personal hatreds, and here and there class interests of one sort and another break out and play a momentary part in the larger movement of affairs; but until the English question once more reappears, there is no central point on which the historian can fix his attention.

Naturally the chroniclers of the time are most concerned with the dramatic incidents of this civil strife. No matter what question of public interest arose, the parties of Burgundy and Orléans were sure to take opposite sides. On the question of England the Orléanists were inclined to keep up the national hatred and to make political capital out of it, while Burgundy, anxious to save its Flemish lands from the certain danger of an English war, was equally active for peace. The leaders were constantly brought together in the royal council, and so long as Duke Philip lived, they were able to keep up a decent show of harmony. After his death in 1404 matters moved rapidly to a crisis, and it was the English war that gave occasion for the outbreak. Louis of Orléans was bent upon its renewal. John of Burgundy, though opposed to this policy, could do no less than support the war when it was once declared (1407), but in the north,

the field of action intrusted to him, he did nothing, while the campaigning of Louis of Orléans in the south was equally barren of results. The leaders came together for the winter in Paris, and had entered upon the usual course of alternate bickerings and festivities when suddenly Louis of Orléans, returning unarmed with a small guard from a visit to the queen, was attacked in the street by a band of ruffians and brutally murdered. Suspicion fell upon Duke John, and after some days of pretended grief he frankly avowed the fact and left the city. A few weeks later he appeared again in Paris before the chief princes of the realm and through his advocate, the famous theologian Jean Petit, delivered a four-hours-long justification of his act as the lawful “removal” of a tyrant who had abused his power to oppress the people. Whatever may have been the value of this ex post facto argument, it is certain that the government – if we can speak of a government – did nothing, and that on the whole public sentiment in Paris approved the deed and was glad to be rid of an oppressor.

IV.

~

THE CIVIL WAR WAS ON. The nominal head of the Orléans party was now Charles, son of the murdered Louis, a youth of eighteen, but the real leader was Charles's father-in-law, Bernard of Armagnac, from whom the party now takes its name. Territorially the Armagnacs became the party of the south and west, against the Burgundians in the north and east. The lesser barons ranged themselves under one or the other banner, and an irregular warfare, destructive to life and property but leading to no clear result, began. The utter lack of national feeling is shown by the zeal of both parties in bargaining with England. The "usurping" king, Henry IV of Lancaster, was only too glad to listen to overtures from any source that might seem to promise a recovery of the English lands in France and thus a gain in his prestige at home. At first Burgundy had the advantage and, with the help of English troops, succeeded in gaining Paris. Then an Armagnac coalition promised to restore to England the duchy of Guienne with many royal fortresses if Henry IV would send troops to aid them against Burgundy. Then again, within a few months, the rival chiefs were entertaining and embracing each other at Auxerre and mutually promising to disavow their foreign alliances.

For a time the center of interest shifts to Paris, the financial heart of the nation and at critical moments the spokesman of the hard-working and tax-paying classes. Once again, in the face of the English peril, the government calls upon the Estates of the North, the Languedoc, to help it out, and again this call is the signal for a new activity of the organized guilds. This time it is the butchers of Paris who take the lead in city affairs, deal as a political unit with John of Burgundy, and undertake to dictate terms to the government. Under the lead of one Simon Caboche they constitute a formidable rival to the constitutional Estates. Their demands were chiefly two: reform of the public administration and war with England; but, as generally happens, this demonstration by the lowest grade of society was only an opportunity for better-trained and more responsible reformers. Everything that happened at Paris between 1413 and 1416 is roughly called "Cabochien," from the name of the butchers' leader, but the really valuable things done were the work not of the Cabochiens themselves but of royal officials, jurists, and theologians, representing especially the University and the corporate government of the city. Such is, for example, the famous "Ordonnance Cabochienne" of May 26, 1413. The calling of the Estates was the signal for a flood of "grievances," poured in from the provinces, from the University, and from the trades, in which the demand of the government for more money was met by counter demands for administrative reforms. There was money enough, it was declared; the only trouble was that the people who had it – the princes, officials, and all their tribe of followers – were not called upon to disgorge. Violent scenes, recalling the days of Étienne Marcel (1357) and reminding us of the "Terror" of 1793 and the "Commune" of 1871, led to the formation of the Ordonnance and its

acceptance by the panic-stricken figment of a government. It interests us as showing what were the evils of administration most keenly felt and what measures were demanded for their remedy. It is a ponderous indictment of the mechanism of government, but it is in no sense a revolutionary document. Like so many similar efforts in the history of the Italian states, it was directed solely to securing a better administration of the constitution as it was. Its main purpose was to avoid the evils of personal appointment of officials by the king or by those who at any given moment stood for him. In place of such personal appointment with all its train of favoritism and corruption was to be substituted a system of elections, – not by any means popular elections, but rather selections of the necessary officials through the established councils of state, such as the Parlement and the Chamber of Accounts. Even the members of these great councils were to be created by election; so that if this scheme had ever worked, it would have resulted in a vast rotary, bureaucratic mechanism no less dangerous to liberty than the method of personal appointment. Every act of the crown was to be referred to its appropriate council, which was thus to serve as a check upon arbitrary abuse of power.

The Cabochian Ordinance was a fine specimen of that nice logical sense so characteristic of the French mind. Its weak point was the absence of any permanent roots in the French people at large. Without substantial power to enforce it the Ordinance was only so much paper, and when the popular demonstration that had called it forth was crushed by an Orléanist revival at Paris it vanished. On the flimsy ground that it had not been regularly approved by the king, it was declared annulled and a copy of it was torn in pieces by the hangman in the presence of the king and the princes. Once more an alliance of “the people” with well-meaning doctrinaires had failed to save France from herself. Civil war broke out again and raged with intermittent fury until the one thing happened that could really touch the sense of national honor, – the renewal of the English peril. The death of Henry IV of Lancaster brought to the English throne his son, Henry V, the “wild prince,” still in the full flower of adventurous youth, but sobered by the responsibility of power. The disorders of France, the absence of any real government there, added to the active persuasions of John of Burgundy, were enough to determine him to renew the claims of England upon the French crown and to make his success at least highly probable. Scarcely a year after his accession he boldly demanded of Charles VI to hand the crown over to him and to seal the union by giving him his daughter in marriage. It is characteristic of the condition of affairs in France that the *de facto* government thought it worth while to pay England the doubtful compliment of proposing to send over an embassy of six hundred persons to offer him the princess together with substantial grants of land, but then, when this generous offer was rejected, informed Henry that he was not even rightful king of England. Naturally the business failed, and Henry pushed forward with energy and skill his preparations for an invasion of France.

His objective point was Harfleur, in the mouth of the Seine, where he might hope to establish an English station for the west that would serve the same purpose which Calais was already serving in the east. Although the nominal center of the French naval power was at Rouen, farther up the Seine, not a step was taken to meet the oncoming of the English. An army variously estimated at from ten to thirty thousand men, with a full equipment of material for a siege and for marching, was landed without accident, and in a month Harfleur was in its hands. From this moment on the history of the campaign of Agincourt is almost a repetition of that of Crécy two generations before. It would seem that Henry V, like Edward III, had no other object than to make a safe military demonstration and get back to a secure place with as little loss as possible. Having now Harfleur, he set out with only eight days' provision to march direct to Calais. Meanwhile a French army had been forming at Rouen, but it was fully two months after the English landing before this disorderly rabble of knightly contingents was ready to move. The old spirit of reckless adventure marked the gathering of this force, too large for management, without capable leadership, and with only slight attention to either strategy or tactics. Henry had planned to cross the Somme near its mouth by the same tidal ford by which Edward III had reached the field of Crécy. His march thither was unobstructed, but he found the ford well defended and turned to follow up the river until he should find a place to cross. As before, all bridges were destroyed by the neighboring people, and it was not until he had passed Amiens and got as far as Nesle that he heard of a place where the river spread out over marshes in such a way that a corduroy road could be thrown across it.

The French had already passed to the north of the English and were moving on a line nearly parallel with them, apparently seeking a favorable point to intercept their northward march and compel them to fight. As usual it was the French who were spoiling for the fray. The young nobles were tumbling over each other in their eagerness to get at the enemy. As usual also they had the advantage of numbers, and this time they reached the field of battle in better condition. The English army was suffering badly from lack of food, but in spite of everything it was held in that strict order which had marked the earlier campaigns. Even at the last moment, according to some authorities, King Henry made overtures to the French, offering to give up Harfleur and pay an indemnity for all damage done if he might be permitted to go on to Calais. Crossing a little stream near the village of Agincourt, the English found the whole French army barring the way and had no resource but to fight.

The battle of Agincourt forms the third in a series of which Crécy and Poitiers are the first two. It is one more demonstration of the superiority of the English arms and English discipline. The attack was begun by their archers, who are reported as lightening their clothing to the last degree and advancing in the heavy mud to a point where they could plant their stakes in firm ground and from behind this temporary shelter could pour in a perfect hail of arrows

upon the enemy. The French center was composed entirely of men at arms on foot flanked by two mounted squadrons. The center moved forward upon the English archers, who gave way a few paces. Then the French riders came up, closing in upon the archers, but by the same movement crowding also upon their own comrades of the center. The horses were no sooner within reach of the English arrows than they were driven wild, reared, and turned upon the French foot soldiers. The archers took advantage of the confusion to rush in between the ranks of the men at arms and ply their daggers with cruel effect; while the regular "battle" of the English knights charged into the mêlée and carried all before them. It was another victory of discipline, steadiness, and good sense over disorganized bravery and boastful contempt of every form of service except the heavy-armed chivalry of the mediæval past. The slaughter of French knights was terrible, and so many prisoners were made that at one moment of the fight, as the fortune of battle seemed turning against him, King Henry gave orders to murder every man of them. Like Charlemagne and Napoleon under similar circumstances, this modern captain was sacrificing no practical advantage to humane sentiment. Seven thousand Frenchmen of noble rank were killed as against an English loss of four or five hundred. Fifteen hundred prisoners were taken, including the dukes of Orléans and Bourbon.

The crushing defeat of Agincourt should have been a revelation to France of the inevitable consequence of national discord. During the whole period of preparation for the English invasion Duke John of Burgundy, by far the most powerful vassal of France, had not only held aloof himself but had ordered his immediate dependents in the north not to answer the king's summons to war. His failure to appear was doubtless one element in the disaster; but worse yet was his attitude of open preference for an English rather than a Valois government for France. Immediately after his victory at Agincourt King Henry pushed on to Calais and embarked for England, having been only three months on French soil. At Paris the first effect was a vigorous Orléans-Armagnac reaction under the lead of Bernard d'Armagnac, father-in-law of the young duke of Orléans and now made Constable of France. It was clear that the real enemy of the government was not England but Burgundy, and every preparation was made to resist an expected attack from Duke John. So complete in fact was this preparation that John found it impossible to reach the city and entered into closer and closer relations with England. In the autumn of 1416 the two rulers had a prolonged interview at Calais which resulted in some kind of understanding whereby Henry was to be left free to reconquer his land of France, while John of Burgundy was to engage the enemies of England in other directions. That slippery diplomat, the emperor Sigismund, under pretence of mediation, allied himself formally with England and Burgundy, and France was thus isolated. If we are inclined to accuse John the Fearless of a shameless act of treason, we must remember that feudal loyalty was a matter of give and take and that it would be idle to expect any good thing from loyalty to

such a feeble thing as this Valois monarchy. Burgundy was as good a name as France, and in the movement of the peoples there was nothing extravagant in the notion of a Burgundian monarchy that might divide the Gallic lands with England and hold the balance of power on the Continent.

Thus carefully prepared, King Henry V came over again in 1417, landed at the mouth of the Seine, and began a systematic reduction of Normandy. This time it was not a raid, but a conquest, that was planned. While Burgundians and Armagnacs were tearing each other in pieces at Paris, the English in several divisions were bringing one town after another into subjection and order. The central point of resistance was Rouen, whose heroic defence of six months is the companion piece to the noble story of Calais. Such episodes as these are the real revelations of the French spirit, crushed and crowded out of sight by the mad egotism of the governing classes. As at Calais, so here no effective attempt was made to relieve the distress of the starving citizens, and the surrender of Rouen meant the loss of all Normandy. Within the captured city Henry V proclaimed himself king of France and received the homage of the Norman barons. If now England and Burgundy could work together, it seemed as if the dismemberment of France were only a matter of a short time. It was openly discussed in the council of King Charles VI, represented for the moment by the wretched Queen Isabella the Bavarian, whether it were not best to treat with England on the basis of the Treaty of Bretigny (1360) and accept in addition the loss of Normandy!

It is at this point that we begin dimly to discern the rise of a new political party destined before long to be the rallying point of the national regeneration, – the party of the Dauphin Charles, the third son of Charles VI to bear this title. This Charles, now a lad of seventeen, had gained his first experience in government as the head of the Orléans-Armagnac faction, and as such he commanded a considerable following in the center and south of France. At the close of the year 1418 he assumed the title of Regent and came into open competition with the court party and with Burgundy. Fortunately for him his entrance into affairs came at a moment when John of Burgundy, not getting out of his English alliance quite all he had hoped, foresaw his profit in adding a second string to his bow and making a treaty with the Dauphin looking toward the expulsion of the English now pressing on nearer and nearer to Paris. The final negotiations were set for September 10 at Montereau but under circumstances of great suspicion and mutual distrust. The interview, held in an inclosed space on the middle of a bridge across the Yonne, was a stormy one, and, though the details are obscure, it seems hardly possible to free the party of the Dauphin from the charge of premeditated violence. The discussion soon turned into mutual recrimination, and it would have been more than human if hands had not been as ready with the sword as tongues were with insults. A general mêlée seems to have taken place, in the midst of which the duke of Burgundy was murdered. There can be no doubt that the murder of Louis of

Orléans twelve years before had left bitter resentments which had with difficulty been kept in check until now, and certainly the recent conduct of Jean sans Peur, his dealings with England, and his double-dealing with France had filled full the measure of a distrust for which murder was only the natural fifteenth-century expression.

In the negotiations that preceded the interview at Montereau John of Burgundy had continually insisted that the Dauphin had no authority to make terms. While on the fatal bridge he had demanded that the lad should go to the king his father at Troyes, and the Dauphin had replied with spirit that he would go to the king when he pleased and not at the duke's orders. In these words we may find at once the gist of the situation and the promise of the future. The party of the Dauphin was a new force, trying to work itself free of the influences that had surrounded the unhappy king. It was largely composed of "new men" similar in type to those who had made the fortune of Charles V. The class of citizens and scholars, despised by the futile chivalry of the princely houses, was to be the instrument by which the monarchy was to be reinvigorated and France redeemed. For the moment things seemed all to be going the other way. The new duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, entered at once into close relations with Henry V of England and joined with him in securing from the government of Charles VI the signature of the Treaty of Troyes. By this document King Charles was made to recognize Henry V as heir to the crown of France to the exclusion of the Dauphin, who is expressly declared an enemy of the state. Henry is at once to enter upon the government of France, according to established principles, and is to marry Catherine, daughter of Charles VI. It remained only to conquer the lands south of the Seine which so far continued loyal to the Dauphin. Henry's entry into Paris was made in the winter of 1420, amid the uproarious joy of the population. As between English and Armagnacs, Paris preferred the English, an expression of that inveterate distrust of the North toward the South which has never been quite absent from French politics.

In the following year, 1421, King Henry crossed again to France and began a vigorous campaign in the country between the Seine and the Loire, the outcome of which was to drive the Dauphin into Aquitaine. Henry wintered in France and was preparing to renew the war in the spring when he was seized with a fatal illness. His heir was an infant of ten months, the future Henry VI. Two months later died also the pitiful object who for thirty years had served as the tool, now of one and now of the other, of the great political parties, but whose name had never served to rally to his service the national sentiment which alone could save France from herself. At the close of the funeral ceremonies for Charles VI the heralds proclaimed "Long life to Henry, our sovereign lord, King of France and England!" The seven years following the death of the two kings mark apparently the lowest point of the national feeling in France. Her government was divided between the "Roi de Paris," represented

by the English regent, the duke of Bedford, and the “Roi de Bourges,” the disinherited son of Charles VI, disavowed by every recognizable authority, by Parlement, by the Estates, and by the chief feudatories of the North. The momentary energy of the royal party, which had expressed itself in the murder of John of Burgundy, gave way almost immediately to an almost incredible egoism and indifference to the common weal. This fifth Valois seemed to be the worst of a very poor lot. He gave himself up to evil counselors, who for their own advantage encouraged his vices of idleness and pleasure seeking. Nothing could rouse him from his slothful self-indulgence, and his resources, considerable at first, melted away until the most degrading tales of his poverty were circulated and believed. Meanwhile the English, fortified in the Île de France, were pushing their conquests into the valley of the Loire. Their administration of the conquered country was strict but equitable. If taxes were heavy, at least the people were protected. The reputation for good order and discipline which had accompanied the English forces from the very beginning of the war continued now. So far as practical advantages were concerned, the inhabitants of Normandy, Picardy, and the Île de France were better off than they had been before. Still it is evident that an important fraction of the people always felt the rule of the English as an “occupation” rather than a permanent conquest. Many voices in prose and verse were heard lamenting the loss of the national honor. The sentiment of French unity was not dead, but only disarmed, scattered, wasted in fruitless appeals to a governing class that had worn itself out in senseless partisan conflicts. What was needed was some impulse, some shock that should bring the best elements of the people to the front and unite them, first against the foreigner and then against the still worse enemies at home. This new motive was to be found in the inspiration of a singlehearted and surprisingly gifted girl. This is not the place to rehearse again the familiar story of Jeanne d’Arc. Stripped of all its unhistorical decorations, there is nothing in the story which violates our sense of the probable in human affairs. Her childhood passed in the midst of the furious raids of Burgundians and Armagnacs had caused her mind, already peculiarly sensitive to ideal impressions, to dwell upon the miseries of life and to embody her own thoughts in the form of visions of saints and angels, the current coin of a devout fifteenth-century imagination. With the clear eyes of childhood she saw only the simple elements of the situation, – a nation without a king and the foreigner on the soil. To restore the king and to oust the English – this was the simple program revealed to her by her spirit-counselors and proclaimed by her to all who would hear as the gospel of regeneration for France. And she was right. It seemed a mad venture, but there were those in the Dauphin’s council who discerned in this semidivine phenomenon a weapon more serviceable than all the persuasions of patriotism or of reason. Presented to the “Roi de Bourges,” she disarmed all criticism by the simplicity of her manner and her unshakable faith in her divine mission. Her demand for troops to relieve the

siege of Orléans, heard at first with a natural derision, was granted, and at once a new spirit of enthusiasm seized upon the entire French army. Orléans was invested by the English forces in a manner not approached by them in any former land siege. A circle of fortresses (bastilles) was built around the city on both sides of the river, and a complete blockade was thus secured. The English themselves were supplied by a line of communication resting upon Paris, so that the fall of Orléans seemed to be only a question of time. The only possible method of relief was by breaking the blockade and gradually capturing the fortresses, and to this task the new energy of the French was now directed. The same sense of a superhuman aid which was inspiring them with new courage was also disheartening their enemies. Skirmish after skirmish resulted in their favor. A firm belief in the invincibility of their virgin leader carried them over every obstacle, and within a few days the gates of Orléans were opened, the victorious Maid had entered at the head of her devoted troops, and the systematic recovery of the surrounding country could begin.

So far the useless princeling in whose name this great feat of arms was accomplished had not stirred; but now the second stage of the program of redemption was proclaimed. The king must be crowned, and nowhere else must this be done but at Rheims, the ancient coronation city of the French kings from Clovis down. It required much persuasion to move the Dauphin even to such a joyous progress as this, but it was done. With a little army of twelve hundred men the king and the Maid set out from Orléans, going by way of Troyes, which received them after a brief resistance, and on the 16th of July, 1429, entered Rheims. The moral effect of the coronation of Charles VII was immediate and decisive. It was as if a ban had suddenly been lifted from the cities of the north and east. Many hastened to send their keys to King Charles; others were occupied without resistance. It would have needed only a decided action to bring Paris into his hands. It was the urgent advice of Jeanne d'Arc to march straight upon the capital; but counsels of diplomacy prevailed. Above all things Burgundy must be conciliated, and precious time was wasted in idle negotiations. Meanwhile the fighting spirit could not be quite restrained. Jeanne led an assault on one of the very gates of Paris, and it was perhaps only a wound of hers that saved the city from capture. One feels at this point that her peculiar mission was ended, but, as with other prophets, her inspirations grew with what they fed on. Her "voices," that so far had confined themselves to general suggestions, became specific, and that is always fatal to prophecy. This have been more than human if the constant repetition of her praises from far and near had not confirmed her in a sort of fatalistic confidence in herself. Without orders from the king she led in several little skirmishes that had no special purpose or result, and in one of these, at Compiègne, she fell by accident into the hands of a Burgundian troop. Like any other piece of captured property she was then for sale to the highest bidder. The infamy of Charles VII begins here, – that he made no move to ransom the

best asset his bankrupt monarchy had found and allowed the unhappy Maid to pass into the pitiless hands of the English. From that moment her doom was sealed. It is a pity for the credit of her captors that she was not quietly put out of the way, as so many another troublesome person was. The long imprisonment, the weary trials, the devilish ingenuity that turned her story of rather conventional spiritual manifestations into confessions of heresy, – all these only serve to bring out into brighter relief the essentially simple motive of the young enthusiast. During these long months many a voice was raised in doubt or open criticism, but never a word came from the one source that might have helped.

It is quite probable that Charles VII, having been carried so far on the rising wave of popular sentiment, was beginning to dread its too insistent force. And, on the other hand, it is more than probable that Jeanne, if she had been spared, might have become the center of intrigues difficult to control. It was cheaper to let her go, and this Valois monarchy had never hesitated at any baseness. The pathetic figure of Jeanne d'Arc, lost for a moment in a frightful calamity, rises henceforth in dignity and sweetness as the type of that national unity she had helped to save. For, after all, her unclouded instinct had been right. The hold of England upon the conquered districts was not strong. Only a determined leadership was needed to gather together all the scattered elements of resistance and fling them in one concerted effort against the invader. For the present there was no visible sign of such leadership. The seven years following the death of Jeanne d'Arc (1429-1436) are as unpromising as any in the whole history of the war. Private enmities breaking out in petty conflicts exhausted the resources of the country in all directions. Only an irregular guerrilla warfare served to keep alive the really great issue, but without decisive result on either side. The first real turning point is seen in the changed attitude of Philip of Burgundy. As time had passed, his relations with England had grown less and less cordial, while it had become more and more evident that his permanent interests lay on the side of France, That is the meaning of the Treaty of Arras made between Charles VII and Duke Philip in 1435. It was definitely intended to be a repudiation of the Treaty of Troyes (1420), but it was hardly less humiliating to the pride of France. King Charles promised to prosecute the murderers of Duke John and to hand over to Philip important territories, especially a line of cities along the river Somme adjacent to the Burgundian lands lying along the Meuse and Scheldt, thus forming a notable increase to the already vast dominion of Philip. Further, both these and the old Burgundian lands were to be held during Philip's life free from the obligations of homage and from all financial dues to the French crown, In short, the way seemed to be paved for that rounding out of a future Burgundian monarchy toward which the policy of the dukes had been steadily tending. The price of these ignominious concessions was to be the breaking of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance and the formal renunciation of all enmity on the score of the murder of

Duke John. France was to save one portion of her territory by placing another portion in hardly less imminent danger.

The final expulsion of the English was aided by political dissensions in England which prevented a vigorous and consistent policy toward France. Charles VII, now a man of thirty, began, though slowly, to realize some of the responsibilities of power and to surround himself with wiser counselor and more effective military commanders. Throughout the northwest repeated local plots against the English rule were utilized as centers of action, and finally, in 1436, it was possible for the French army under the count of Richemont to make its entry into Paris. In 1444 a truce of twenty-two months was made on the basis of the status quo and was prolonged until 1449. In that year the war broke out again, at once in Normandy and in Guienne. In Normandy the French success was so rapid and decisive that by the close of 1450 the whole province was in French hands. In the south the fortune of the war turned largely upon the fate of Bordeaux, the great rich city of the western coast, industrially by far the most important possession of the English on the Continent. The English in Guienne had of late adopted the very liberal policy of letting things go pretty much as suited the local interests, and the inhabitants, not through any English sentiment but only in dread of a more exacting government, were little inclined to meet the French advances halfway. It required four years of campaigning by land and sea before the English domination in the south could be broken. In this last stage of the great war the parts of the adversaries appear changed. It is here the French who represent stern discipline and a grim determination to push the national struggle to the end. The surrender of Bordeaux in 1453 marks the final absorption of Guienne into the royal administration of France. It was the dramatic culmination of the national upbuilding, just as the loss of Calais, one hundred and six years before, had marked the beginning of the national disintegration.

V.

~

IT WOULD BE A GREAT exaggeration to suppose that the lesson of the Hundred Years' War had been thoroughly learned. It is easy enough now to perceive that the ills of France had come largely from the failure of her governing classes to grasp the responsibilities of government; but, looking at things as they were in 1453, it is hard to perceive any very great change in this respect. If England had been in position to turn all her energies to the maintenance of her French conquests, to winning the affection of her subjects there by wise economic measures, and to a sound development of the country, one can see no good reason why she might not be there yet. Certainly it was no love for their Valois rulers that held the people of France finally to their French allegiance. In certain definite respects, however, we can note improvements destined to be the germs of a permanent progress. The campaigns of the great war had been fought, on the French side, with armies still organized under mainly feudal conditions. True, the old feudal service had changed largely into that of professional, mercenary bands, but the traditional weakness of the king had continued. Where formerly he had been unable to hold permanently the service of his greater barons, now he was not able to find the money to pay hired troops under his own orders. Still, as before, he had been compelled to bargain with the provincial nobility to get soldiers, and we have seen how utterly untrustworthy such a system was. Not that there was not enough fighting material in France. One of the chief anxieties of the government was the superabundance of armed men roughly organized in "Companies," who were getting their living off the common people in all parts of the country, plundering merchants and making life unsafe for honest men and women. Again and again attempts had been made, as in the time of Du Guesclin, to get rid of these troublesome servants by employing or transporting them, but always, in every lull of actual warfare, they had reappeared to plague the land anew.

The truce of 1444 was the moment taken by Charles VII to remedy this primary evil by a systematic reorganization of the French military system. The beginnings of this undertaking were almost ludicrously modest. A maximum of two thousand "lances" was set as the nucleus of what was to become the royal army. A "lance" consisted of one fully armed fighting man with a squire, a *coutillier*, a *valet de guerre*, and two archers, all mounted. The army would thus number twelve thousand mounted men divided into twenty companies of one hundred "lances" each. A company was to be under the command of a captain, a professional soldier selected from the numerous unemployed bands that had been terrorizing the country, but now to be utilized against them. These captains were chosen with great care and bound by oath to the permanent service of the king. They were to pick their own men and were to hold them to a strict account as to conduct. Still more striking is the provision for a service of foot soldiers. The most important lesson of the Hundred Years' War was the

superiority of a well-managed infantry over even a well-armed and courageous cavalry, but down to this time the governing classes had not been willing to learn the lesson. There had always, however, been a considerable communal militia maintained in the larger towns, armed mainly with the crossbow and organized into fraternities of the usual mediæval type. Again and again they had offered their services in time of active warfare, but had either been rejected or if actually employed had been destroyed in action by the foolish military pride of the governing classes. Where foot soldiery had been utilized at all, it had generally been in the form of hired foreign companies without interest in the national cause and certain to prove a scourge of the land when active campaigning ceased. These communal troops were now to be set in honor as an integral part of the military strength of the nation. Their fraternities were recognized by royal ordinance, their privileges confirmed and increased, and measures taken to encourage them in practice with their peculiar weapon. A still further encouragement was given to the military spirit by the institution of the "Free Archers." In every parish one archer, the best that could be found, was to be enlisted as the king's especial soldier, – not a professional, but bound to appear fully equipped upon the royal summons. In return he was exempted from all taxation, as well by the crown as by the local authorities. The number of such "free" bowmen was at first about eight thousand, but rose in a few years to double that figure. The effect of these military reforms was naturally to free the crown from its former dependence upon the good will of the great feudatories. It must not be supposed that they could be made fully effective at once, but they mark a change in the whole national attitude. It was already a victory for the crown that they could be undertaken at all, and the spirit that underlies them is seen in the decisive actions of 1449 to 1453.

The same general principles are to be seen in the dealings of Charles VII with the other elements of the monarchy. Building upon the old administrative framework, he made use of every opportunity to strengthen his hold upon the provinces by supporting the royal officials in their attempts to administer justice and to collect the revenues of the crown. The success of these experiments depended entirely upon the extent to which the king could make it worth while for his officials to be loyal to him. In loyalty to the king was to be found the only practical expression of national patriotism. This object was secured by a continuous process of advancing men of capacity in the royal service and maintaining them in honor by sufficient grants of power and income. It was a part of the modern process of substituting for the domination of a small party of great nobles the influence of an army of interested officials drawn mainly from the lower nobility or from the bourgeoisie. Naturally this process was resisted by the great territorial lords and by those princes of the blood who, during the pitiful times of Charles VI and the youth of Charles VII, had been the actual rulers of the country. So long as the English had been in the land it had always been possible to bring pressure upon the king by

conspiring with the foreign enemy; but when the English were gone the most fruitful source of treasonable intrigue was removed. There remained Burgundy, and the last years of Charles VII were embittered and his work of reconstruction crippled by the persistent encouragement given by this his most powerful vassal to the open or half-concealed rebellion of his son Louis, afterward the redoubtable King Louis XI. If we try to sum up the results of the Hundred Years' War, we are met by the same curious paradoxes as in the Italy of the same period. The records of the time are filled with pitiful accounts of desolation and misery. The almost continual campaigning on a larger or a smaller scale would seem hardly to have left time for the industries of the people to go on. Yet France in this interval had made solid gains in all that goes to make up a civilized existence. It is a period of great advance in all the arts. Literature had progressed at once along the lines of the common tongue and the serious Latin of the schools. History, pursued as a branch of literature, produced some of its most splendid monuments. Legal science, developed at the schools of Montpellier and Orléans, was continually called into service in building up that vast structure of rights on which the future monarchy was to rest, in expounding the ancient customs that formed the basis of local resistance, or in furnishing weapons to both parties in the never-ending conflict of church and state.

It was an age of luxury in living. Satirists and moralists alike complain of reckless expenditure as the commonest of vices. The dress of the time shows us fashions far from simple. The customs of the landed gentry with their hunting and hawking, their games and jousts, their exaggerated sentiments of courtesy, were imitated by the newly created nobility of money and by the fat citizens of the *bonnes villes*. The decline of morals kept pace with the increasing luxury. All the complaints familiar to periods of great material prosperity reappear in the midst of this society that at times seemed to be on the verge of dissolution. The fact is that the period, in France as elsewhere, was big with the new constructive ideas that were making the modern as distinguished from the mediæval world. In spite of the drain of continuous warfare the productive power of the country was undiminished. The great cities were growing to be the mainstay of the national principle. Again and again during the war they had checked the flood of invasion, had furnished the means for raising new armies, and had contributed their own citizens freely in the national cause.